



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
SEPTEMBER 22, 2005
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES
APPROVED 10-06-2005**

PRESENT: Kevin Osterman, Council Member
E.L. Cortez, Vice Chairman
James Heitel, Commission Member
Michael D'Andrea, Development Member
Michael Schmitt, Design Member
Jeremy A. Jones, Design Member

ABSENT: Kevin O'Neill, Development Member

STAFF: Tim Curtis
Lusia Galav
Al Ward
Tim Connor
Sherry Scott
Bill Verschuren
Kira Wauwie

CALL TO ORDER

The regular session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Osterman at 1:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

OPENING STATEMENT

Councilman Osterman read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

MINUTE APPROVAL

September 8, 2005 Study Session Meeting Minutes
September 8, 2005 Regular Session Meeting Minutes

VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 8TH STUDY SESSION MEETING MINUTES AND THE SEPTEMBER 8TH REGULAR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES.

Board Member Schmitt requested that the Study Session Minutes be amended to reflect that he was not present at the September 8th Study Session.

THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HEITEL AND CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

CONTINUATIONS

- | | | |
|----|-------------------|---|
| 3. | <u>23-DR-2005</u> | <u>Scottsdale Municipal Airport Parking Lot Expansion</u>
15000 N. Airport Drive
Tornow Design Associates, Architects |
| 4. | <u>10-PP-2005</u> | <u>Whisper Rock Unit 6 - The Estates</u>
Preliminary Plat
32800 N. Hayden Road
Gilbertson Associates, Inc., Architects |

Ms. Galav noted that case number 23-DR-2005 is being continued indefinitely and case number 10-PP-2005 is being continued to the October 6th meeting.

VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED FOR THE CONTINUANCE OF CASE NUMBER 23-DR-2005 AND CASE NUMBER 10-PP-2005 TO THE OCTOBER 6TH BOARD MEETING. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

CONSENT AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|-------------------|--|
| 5. | <u>9-PP-2005</u> | <u>DC Ranch Parcel 2.8</u>
Preliminary Plat
SWC Thompson Peak Parkway & East
Desert Camp Drive
Wood, Patel & Assoc., Engineers |
| 6. | <u>61-DR-2005</u> | <u>DC Ranch Parcel 2.8</u>
Site Plan & Elevations
SWC Thompson Peak Parkway & East
Desert Camp Drive
Wood, Patel & Assoc., Engineers |
| 7. | <u>49-DR-2005</u> | <u>Raintree Mini-Storage</u>
Site Plan & Elevations
7227 E. Williamsive
SKD Architecture, Architects |

8. 51-DR-2005 Eagles Pass
 Site Plan, Elevations, Entry Monuments,
 Landscaping & Wall Treatments
 NEC Jomax Road & Alma School Parkway
 Lamb Architects
9. 59-DR-2005 Park Break Office
 Site Plan & Elevations
 14080 N. Northsight Boulevard
 Mittelstaedt & Cooper Associates Ltd.

**VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE NUMBERS WITH ALL
CURRENT ATTACHED STIPULATIONS:**

**9-PP-2005 (DC RANCH PARCEL 2.8)
61-DR-2005 (DC RANCH PARCEL 2.8)
49-DR-2005 (RAINTREE MINI-STORAGE)
51-R-2005 (EAGLES PASS) AND
5-DR-2005 (PARK BREAK OFFICE)**

**THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER JONES AND CARRIED
UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0)**

REGULAR AGENDA

10. 52-ZN-1997#4 X Lofts
 Recommendation on Amending the
 Development Standards for Case
 52-ZN-1997#3
 7044, 7050, 7106, 7116 & 7126 E. Osborn Road
 Osborn Common Investors, Applicant

Bill Verschuren presented the case per the staff packet. Highlights of the presentation included a brief history of the case, an aerial photo, and the approved elevations.

Stan Lasarde, Todd and Associates Architects, 4019 North 44th Street, Phoenix, addressed the Board regarding the new elevations presented for consideration, noting the intent to create more movement and interest in the parapet heights of the building with the variance request.

In response to a question by Board Member D'Andrea regarding the spirit of the 25 percent increase, Mr. Verschuren explained that the downtown zoning ordinance, as was written in 1985, included what is called a "setback plane" which allows 25 percent of elements of a building to break that plane by 15 feet. He further explained that part of the PBD allows development standards to be amended in the zoning ordinance. There are a number of projects throughout the downtown district that have amended these standards in order to be conducive towards the project.

In response to query by Councilman Osterman regarding the maximum allowable elevation in the downtown overlay, Mr. Verschuren stated that the zoning district in the downtown overlay dictates the overall allowable height. There are a variety of zoning

districts in the Downtown District that have a variety of heights. In this particular case, the maximum height is 50 feet.

Councilman Osterman requested confirmation that the overall elevation of the building is going to increase from 25-feet to 33-feet. Mr. Verschuren clarified that additional height is not being requested; noting that the elevations are the original height that were approved at City Council. The request is to modify the step-back plane: instead of 25 percent of the elevation, they want to go out 33 percent of the elevation.

In response to a question by Board Member Schmidt, Mr. Verschuren confirmed that the amendment to the development standard was not requested at the time the case was approved. The prior elevation approval included a stipulation stating that the standard must be met. The elevations were modified in order to meet that standard, and once the modification was completed, the Applicant was dissatisfied with the design, which led to the request to amend the development standard.

Board Member Jones noted that the modifications seem to meet the intention of the reasons the exceptions are allowed to be made. He stated that the request is being made to improve the appearance of the project, meets the original intention and is acceptable.

Commissioner Heitel recalled that the Applicant was very accommodative during the zoning case and the pedestrian connectivity issues were resolved in the site plan. He opined that the horizontal modification is not a huge issue and expressed support for the request.

BOARD MEMBER SCHMITT MOVED FOR A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL. SECONDED BY VICE-CHAIRMAN CORTEZ. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

11. 87-DR-2004#2 Bank Of America At Hayden Peak Crossing
 Site Plan, Elevations & Landscaping
 SEC Hayden Road & Thompson Peak Parkway
 Gensler, Architects

Kira Wauwie presented the case per the staff packet. Highlights of the presentation including the site plan, a close-up of Pad D, elevations, and review of the design guidelines pertaining to the project. Staff is recommending denial due to lack of response to the design guidelines.

Board Member Jones commended Ms. Wauwie on a fair and balanced presentation of the project. He expressed dismay in the layout, providing comparisons with other projects and noting that the main orientation of the drive-thru detracts from the whole project. He expressed not seeing any reason that the drive-thru could not have been on a different side of the building and opined that the project needs to be completely rearranged.

Vice-Chairman Cortez questioned how this particular branch responds to the existing architectural elements of the center. Ms. Wauwie volunteered to obtain the photos from the file.

Commissioner Heitel noted the potential of Hayden Road turning into an extremely busy thorough-fare as well as problems with locating the type of proposed median cuts at the minimal distance to the signalize intersection. In response to questions by Commissioner Heitel regarding the establishment and rationale for the median cut on Hayden Road, Ms. Wauwie suggested that the median cuts were established at the time of either zoning or at the time of the overall center review on this project. The median cuts were not part of this subject site evaluation.

Board Member D'Andrea expressed concerns regarding the driveways, noting that three driveways in that distance, while it might meet a requirement, seem to be excessive and wondered if they are a necessity.

Ms. Wauwie directed the Board's attention to the site boundaries and explained that the pad site is the matter currently before the Board, rather than the remainder of the property.

Board Member D'Andrea queried why the driveway could not have been north. Scott McCage of Gensler, 201 East Washington, Suite 1950, Phoenix, Arizona addressed the Board regarding the proposed drive-thru location. He explained that several renditions were developed for the site, placing the drive-thru in various locations, before ending up with the proposed configuration. He noted visibility and security as the driving forces in determining the placement of the proposed drive-thru. Upon further elaboration, Mr. McCage stated that an alternate site plan and elevations were available for review, should the Board choose not to approved the proposed plan.

Board Member Jones noted concerns with the proposed drive-thru and landscape plan and expressed an interest in viewing the alternate site plan/elevations.

Board Member D'Andrea noted Mr. McCage's security concerns and pointed out that stacking is going to occur due to the access point being the driveway with a single isle. He further noted that bringing the cars through the main parking lot appears to be a less safe option than over one sidewalk, onto the main road. Board Member D'Andrea stated that he would not support the drive-thru in the proposed location and expressed an interest in viewing the alternate plan.

In response to a question by Board Member D'Andrea regarding the service entrance, Mr. McCage indicated that the panel is painted to match the building but is not screened or recessed into the building. The light fixtures are not recessed.

Mr. McCage presented the alternate option, noting staff's support of the drive-thru to the south. Highlights of the presentation included a site plan and elevations.

Board Member D'Andrea expressed an interest in viewing elevations in color, noting significant changes that the Board may want the Applicant to address due to the different orientation of the building. A discussion ensued regarding the status of the case and the Board's options. Ms. Galav recommended that the case be continued to enable a staff review of the plan, including the application of current stipulations as they relate to this version of the plan.

Board Member Jones expressed favor for the revised site plan and the color selection, and suggested the option that the case be approved pending further study by the staff.

Staff maintains the option of approving the case or returning to the Board for further review. He opined that the case is not that complicated. Councilman Osterman concurred, noting that the Applicant is putting forth great efforts to work with the Board on the project.

Board Member D'Andrea agreed with Board Member Jones.

Board Member Schmitt requested further clarification regarding the amended stipulation concerning the requirement to screen the service entrance section. Mr. McCage informed the Board that in the new scheme, with the drive-thru to the south, the service entrance is recessed.

BOARD MEMBER JONES MOVED THAT FOR CASE 84-DR-2005#2 THAT THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD APPROVE THE ALTERNATE SITE PLAN AND ELEVATION, PENDING FURTHER STUDY AND REVIEW BY THE STAFF. STAFF RETAINS THE OPTION OF BRINGING THE CASE BACK TO THE BOARD, SHOULD THE STAFF FIND THE NEED TO DO SO.

SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HEITEL, WHO ADDED THE PROVISION THAT STAFF PAY INTENSE ATTENTION TO THE NEWLY REVISED ELEVATION ON HAYDEN ROAD, PARTICULARLY WITH SERVICE DOORS FACING HAYDEN ROAD.

Commissioner Heitel indicated that his support for the case is based on the representation that the Development Review Board has no opportunity to modify the median cuts or driveway locations. He requested confirmation of the representations made.

Upon inquiry by Councilman Osterman, Board Member Jones confirmed that the provision added by Commissioner Heitel was clearly in the spirit of his intentions.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, Vice-Chairman Cortez moved to adjourn the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board at 1:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
A-V Tronics, Inc.